

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on June 28, 2005.

Claims 1 and 7 are amended. Claims 5-6 are canceled. No claims are added. As a result, claims 1, 3-4, 7-46, and 48 are now pending in this application.

Incorrect Title in Most Recent Office Action

The title was previously amended to “Security Systems and Methods for Visual Display”. However, the most recent Office Action incorrectly lists the title as “Security System and Method for Visual Display”. Applicant respectfully requests that the correct title appear on the next communication from the Patent Office.

Amendments to Claims 1 and 7

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Independent claim 1 has been amended by substituting the phrase “wherein the modified data has a first degree of blur, a second degree of blur, no blur, or is illegible to a display user, wherein the degree of blur is varied in accordance with the at least one data attribute, and wherein the first and second degrees of blur have reduced legibility but are not” for the phrase “the modified data having reduced legibility but not being”. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in the original disclosure at page 5, lines 24-25.

The dependency of claim 7 has been switched from claim 5 to claim 1.

Rejection of Claims 31, 3-46, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as Unpatentable over Masumoto in view of Parikh

Claims 1, 3-46, and 48 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto et al. (U.S. 2002/0036652) in view of Parikh et al. (U.S. 5,801,697).

Masumoto appears to disclose a presentation system comprising a projector 200 (FIG. 11) coupled to a personal computer 100. Certain text written in a designated font (FIG. 10) is

displayed on a display 102 and visible to the presenter, but it is not displayed on a display 90 viewable by an audience (refer to page 4, paragraphs 0071-0072). It will be noted in Masumoto that text is either fully displayed or invisible to an audience (see paragraphs 0110 and 0116, for example).

Parikh appears to disclose an information security feature for a laptop computer, in which a visible area (50, FIG. 2) within an overall obscured area (52, FIG. 2) may be defined by user action, e.g. by moving a mouse pointer or in various other ways (col. 2, lines 64-67). The appearance of the obscured area may be varied by the user, e.g. by altering the color or intensity (col. 2, lines 47-51). The user can designate a predefined area to always remain visible, e.g., a date or title (col. 3, lines 1-6). The size of the visible area may be varied by the user (col. 3, lines 35-37).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest every limitation of the claim. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA, 1974). MPEP §2143.

The asserted combination of Masumoto and Parikh fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations present in independent claim 1, as amended, so a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Masumoto fails to disclose all of the elements recited in claim 1, as amended. For example, Masumoto doesn't disclose the modified data having "a first degree of blur, a second degree of blur, no blur, or is illegible to a display user, wherein the first and second degrees of blur have reduced visibility but are not illegible to the display user". Masumoto appears only to disclose the data being invisible or visible (see Paras. 100 and 116).

Parikh fails to disclose "modifying the data to form modified data, responsive to a value of the at least one data attribute". In Parikh, the degree of obscuring is controlled by a cursor position, for example (see col. 2, lines 62-67) and not by the value of at least one data attribute.

The Examiner stated that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of Parikh to provide the advantage of reducing or eliminating the problem of exposing valuable information to others on a display". Applicant respectfully traverses this argument. In Masumoto, the user is concerned only with making the information visible or invisible on the public display screen (990, FIG. 4) and not with providing different degrees of

blurring. In Masumoto, the intended viewers are looking at the public display screen 990 and not at the presenter's screen 912, so there is no incentive to provide different degrees of blurring in Masumoto.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine them to arrive at Applicant's claimed subject matter. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. MPEP §2143.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Parikh should be withdrawn.

Regarding independent claims 8, 15, 22, and 46, Applicant continues to assert their patentability over the art of record, including Matsumoto and Parikh. However, in the event that independent claim 1 is found to be allowable but the rejection of independent claims 8, 15, 22, and 46 is maintained, Applicant would consider making corresponding amendments to claims 8, 15, 22, and 46.

Additional Elements and Limitations

Applicant considers additional elements and limitations of claims 1, 3-4, 7-46, and 48 to further distinguish over the cited references, and Applicant reserves the right to present arguments to this effect at a later date.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3-4, 7-46, and 48 are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney, Walter W. Nielsen (located in Phoenix, Arizona) at (602) 298-8920, or the below-signed attorney (located in Minneapolis, Minnesota) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWARD O. CLAPPER

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 349-9592

Date Sept. 28, 2005

By Ann M. McCrackin
Ann M. McCrackin
Reg. No. 42,858

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 28th day of September, 2005.

Anne M. Richards

Name

Anne M. Richards

Signature